

**From:** Cash, Marcia  
**To:** [Bowman, Randal](#); [Shulman, Stu](#)  
**Cc:** [Marcia Cash](#)  
**Subject:** Re: latest version of "draft codes ..."  
**Date:** Friday, May 26, 2017 1:42:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [DRAFT CODES FOR SORTING PUBLIC COMMENTS.v1.docx](#)

---

I'll email this to him now that his training is complete.

I modified the layout for readability, but the words are the same.

**Marcia Cash**  
eERDMS - eRecords - BPHC Representative  
eRulemaking / FDMS Administrator

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**  
*Division of Policy, Performance, and Management Programs (PPM)*  
*(Formerly Division of Policy and Directives Management - PDM)*  
5275 Leesburg Pike, MS: BPHC  
Falls Church, VA 22041-3808  
Telephone: **703-358-2013**  
Fax: 703-358-1997

On Fri, May 26, 2017 at 2:37 PM, Bowman, Randal <[randal\\_bowman@ios.doi.gov](mailto:randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov)> wrote:

Have you passed this on to Dr. Shulman? If not, its attached - same as what I sent you yesterday, but this way you won't need to look for it.

May 24, 2017  
DRAFT SORTING OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

**FIRST**, to the maximum extent possible within the capabilities of the system, sort out and count general comments **a) for and against the review overall**, and

**b) for and against changes at individual named monuments** with minimal staff review.

Many of the general comments do not appear to be form letters, but the non-form-letters often use similar wording. Based on a non-statistical sampling of comments displayed, use of the following words or terms indicates a general comment against the review or against changes to existing monuments:

“Backcountry Hunters & Anglers”,  
“awe inspiring monuments”,  
“continue to preserve”,  
“please preserve”,  
“Do not alter or change”,  
“as is”,  
“maintaining the current national monument designations”,  
“Theodore Roosevelt”\*,  
“should have been protected 50 years ago”,  
“an attack on America”,  
“preserved for future generations”,  
“citizen co-owner of our country's public lands”,  
“created through a process of public input”  
“treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo”,  
“deep concern about the current review”,  
“opposition to the review”,  
“monuments under review”,  
“protect our national parks and public lands”,  
“exploited for private gain” or  
“protect each of the 27”.

Letters supporting the review often include  
“support the review” and  
“oppose use of the Antiquities Act”.

**SECOND**, Information we want to capture from comments having new information (not in priority order): Hopefully the “Word Cloud” can do most of the sorting once the comment is classified as having new information.

**Sort term: names of the 27 monuments** on the review list, or multiple such names

then if there is information on -

public access,  
recreational use –  
hunting,  
fishing,  
hiking,

the effects of a designation on the available uses of adjoining Federal lands beyond the monument boundaries;

the effects of a designation on the use and enjoyment of non-Federal lands within or beyond monument boundaries - sort terms: **“public access” “recreational use”, “recreational uses”**

cultural, particularly Tribal, or historic sites not currently included in a monument or not adequately protected by Proclamation or regulations – sort terms:

**“cultural resources” . “Tribal sites”, “Tribal uses”, “historic sites”**

inholdings – sort term **“inholding”**

**legal** comments or analysis

**“grazing”**

**energy or minerals** – sort terms **“oil” , “gas” , “energy” “mining”**

whether monument exceeds "the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected"; sort term: **“smallest area compatible”**

whether protected resources in monument are appropriately classified as "historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, [or] other objects of historic or scientific interest";- sort terms: **“historic landmark” , “historic structure” , “prehistoric structure” , “objects of historic or scientific interest”**

if comment is **from State, Tribal or local government** - ? (any usual process/term for sorting these?)

information on public input on establishment of the Monument: sort term: **“public input”**

proposes other Monuments for review – sort term: **“National Monument” preceded by a name not on our list of 27**

**significant “other”** – reviewer to note subject(s) and report them at end of shift